

MEETING #34 – October 24

At a Regular Meeting of the Madison County Board of Supervisors on October 24, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. in the Madison County Administrative Center Auditorium located at 414 N. Main Street:

PRESENT: R. Clay Jackson, Chairman
Jonathon Weakley, Vice-Chairman
Robert Campbell, Member
Kevin McGhee, Member
Jack Hobbs, County Administrator
V. R. Shackelford, County Attorney
Mary Jane Costello, Asst. County Administrator/Finance Director
Jacqueline S. Frye, Deputy Clerk

ABSENT: Charlotte Hoffman, Member

Call to Order

Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence

1. Determine Presence of a Quorum/Adopt Agenda

Chairman Jackson advised that a quorum was present. Supervisor Hoffman will be absent.

Chairman Jackson advised that the Board will need to enter into a closed session with possible action afterwards.

Chairman Jackson called for additions, deletions or adoption of today's agenda.

Supervisor Weakley moved that today's Agenda be approved as presented, seconded by Supervisor McGhee. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Absent: Hoffman. Nays: (0).*

2. Public Comment:

Chairman Jackson opened the floor for public comment. With no public comment being brought forth, the public comment opportunity was closed.

3. Constitutional Officers –





Commonwealth Attorney

Clarissa Berry, Commonwealth Attorney, was present and advised that an open house was held this afternoon for the Victim-Witness office; members and the public were invited to come view the upgrades to the area and the child behavioral room which is now available for use.

4. County Departments – None

a. Economic Development & Tourism: Tracey Williams Gardner, Director, was present and advised that she will be unavailable for the next monthly meeting. Highlights from her department consisted of the following:

Business Appreciation Banquet scheduled for 11/15/17 (Brent Leake will be the guest speaker)

-  New QuickBooks workshop will be scheduled
-  Several weekend activities noted on the Chamber website
-  Closing held on the old Last Nickle building (downstairs will be fashion consignment – upstairs will host a B&B [SUP to be attained from the Town] – business will open in mid-November 2017)
-  New business in Shelby will be selling granite counter tops

- ✚ Tourism Committee meeting was held on 9/28/17 (discussion of upcoming budget, signage [pricing has been researched])
- ✚ Next Tourism Committee meeting will be scheduled for 12/12/17 at 1:30 p.m.
- ✚ Brochure will be updated with many changes
- ✚ Over 20,000 brochures were distributed at the Welcome Center
- ✚ Website will host an economic development page
- ✚ Working with the Town Council on the revolving loan fund (once these funds have been signed out twice, the Town can utilize the funds for improvements)
- ✚ Christmas Tree Lighting event is scheduled for 12/1 at 5:45 p.m. on the WMB lawn
- ✚ Opening of the coffee shop is on hold at this time
- ✚ Election dinner on 11/7/17 hosted by the Etlan Methodist Church (at the firehouse)

Supervisor Weakley: Referred to a recently approved zoning case presented by Mr. Gentry; business will be located off Route 29

Ms. Gardner advised that she was aware of the development.

5. Committees or Organizations:

6. Finance

a. September 2017 Claims

\$184,486.85 (10'20'17)

\$ 51,113.15 (10'24'17)

\$235,600.00 (Total)

Highlights:

- ✓ \$69,713.61 (2 payments made on leasing/finance transactions [1 for E911 equipment – 2 more payments due] [\$29,000.00 for police vehicles that were financed] \$41,000.00 (true up adjustment for the Rappahannock Juvenile Detention Center)

Supervisor Campbell moved that the Board approve October 2017 claims totaling \$236,600.00 as presented, seconded by Supervisor McGhee. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Nays: (0). Absent: Hoffman.*

- *Supervisor Campbell: Questioned this year's rotation schedule to purchase vehicles for law enforcement*

Erik Weaver, Sheriff, was present and advised that last year's rotation called for the purchase of:

Six (6) vehicles: Two (2) vehicles were purchased

This years' schedule: Four (4) new vehicles and one (1) used

7. Minutes:

a. #31, #32, #33

Chairman Jackson called for corrections and/or approval of Minutes #31, #32, and #33.

Supervisor McGhee moved that the Board approve Minutes #31, #32 and #33 as presented, seconded by Supervisor Campbell. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Nays: (0). Absent: Hoffman.*

8. Old Business:

a. Town of Madison Sidewalk Project – Dan Painter, Madison Town Council: Dan Painter of the Madison Town Council was present and advised that today's update contains basically the same information as at a previous meeting; discussions were held with the VDOT Coordinator of Bicycling & Pedestrian Services (Richmond) and advised that the costs need to be slightly adjusted from \$33.60 per linear foot to \$38.00 per linear foot which yielded the following costs:

1. Church Street (Town) - 575 x 38.00 = \$21,850
2. Main Street (Town) - 235 x 38.00 = \$8930.00

3A. Main Street (Town) - $750 \times \$38.00 = \$28,500.38$.

3B. Main Street (County) - $730 \times \$38.00 = \$27,740$

4. Main Street (County) - $1950 \times \$38.00 = \$74,100$

TOTALS- Town= $\$21,850 + \$8,930 + \$28,500 = \$59,280$

VDOT/Local (80/20) - $\$47,424/\$11,856$

County= $\$27,740 + \$74,100 = \$101,840$

VDOT/Local (80/20) - $\$81,472/\$20,368$ (County)

Combined Total= $\$161,120$

It was noted that the numbers provided are somewhat 'soft' and may not be exact, but in the applicable pricing range.

Comments from the Board:

- *Chairman Jackson: County is being asked to provide a fifteen percent (15%) increase over previous figures provided; questioned the costs for potential drainage and easements (feels the cost will be about \$24,000/\$25,000 [instead of \$20,368 as noted])*
- *Supervisor Campbell Questioned if the project will involve any curbing and/or gutters – and only sidewalks*
- *Supervisor Weakley: Questioned if the sidewalks will be concrete or paved*
- *Supervisor McGhee: Referred to a note provided from a citizen concerning potential use of sidewalks (i.e. citizen hasn't observed a lot of pedestrian traffic in the proposed area [town to post office]); questioned estimate amount of potential sidewalk usage*

Responses from Mr. Painter:

- Proposed costs are for sidewalks only
- Sidewalk projects aren't as complicated as roadway projects (i.e. there isn't much drainage issues)
- Most sidewalk projects are done with no engineering costs attached (i.e. after right-of-way and easements are in order)
- Proposed sidewalks will be concrete (better life span) as opposed to asphalt
- There is no way to provide any estimate of potential sidewalk usage without specific facilities in place (i.e. sidewalks, pedestrian lanes, bike lanes)

Feels that more people would walk the route if sidewalks were in place (route would be safer)

Additional Comments:

- *Chairman Jackson: Feels today's proposed costs will only be the 'start' of the project; topography and easements will result in additional costs; feels these types of projects should be a part of the County's budgetary process; although the County is in a healthy financial position, he encouraged the Board to refrain from allocating funding 'on a whim'*
- *Supervisor Campbell: Advised (in his opinion) these types of projects are a case of 'throwing good money after bad'; referred to additional costs involved with the prior Main Street Project; feels the proposed project will eventually call for additional costs (i.e. curb, gutters); suggested the proposed project be fully planned; verbalized disfavor of supporting the project; concerned about the proposed B&B in the upstairs of a building (located in the Town)*
- *Supervisor Weakley: Accolades given to the Town for today's proposal to install sidewalks; suggested this type of project have an engineer on board to assess any unknown issues and/or costs (as noted by Supervisor Campbell), and ADA compliance requirements, water, sewer, power, etc.: the proposed plan may also be a means to allow existing power lines to be relocated beneath the sidewalks as opposed to being above*
- *Supervisor McGhee: Questioned if the Town is looking for the County to 'partner' in order to start the proposed project; advised disfavor of committing without the County being provided concrete estimates for the overall costs (up to a certain amount)*

Responses from Mr. Painter:

- Projects with extensive details don't require engineering work
- Sidewalk projects don't require utilities to run alongside (as do roadways)
- Existing power lines are now overhead – doesn't feel this will change anytime soon (i.e. would involve extensive costs)
- Engineering services will cost an extensive amount
- Basic sidewalks generally lay on top of the ground and above any waterlines (as opposed to lines that run down the middle of a roadway)
- There is no sewer line in place (to the best of his knowledge)
- The proposed project (in his opinion) is relatively simple and will not require extensive labor
- Town is looking at the proposed project to provide convenience/safety to those individuals that walk along the Main Street (i.e. school, post office, businesses)

Additionally, based on comments pertaining to planning, folks are looking to live in communities that offer safe walking areas as an option to alleviate the need to drive short distances. In closing, it's understood that the County doesn't have funding budgeted for today's proposed request; however, the Town does have some available funding and feels the proposal will be a good expenditure, and plans to support moving forward excluding some of the portions described in today's proposal.

Additional comments from the Board:

Chairman Jackson: Verbalized concerns that the proposed project will involve pouring of concrete along a path without any input from an engineer and will have no consideration for any possible run-off; also referred to the application deadline (of November 1, 2017)

Supervisor McGhee: Questioned if right-of-way has been attained; suggested the Board request feedback from Joel DeNunzio (VDOT)

In closing, Mr. Painter noted that:

- When a sidewalk isn't attached to a roadway, concrete is just poured
- Curbing and guttering isn't needed if a sidewalk is detached from the roadway
- Reference was made to a portion of the newly built roadway in Charlottesville (i.e. asphalt path w/no curbing or gutters)

Supervisor Campbell moved that the Board reject the proposed sidewalk project (as presented by the Town of Madison) at this time, seconded by Supervisor Weakley.

Discussion:

- *Supervisor Weakley: Questioned if the Board needed to vote if no action will be taken on the proposal project; questioned the 'message' that the County may be sending (to the Town)*
- *Supervisor Campbell: Explained that the County hasn't been provided information regarding elevation; advised disfavor of accepting today's proposal, but would be in favor if a different plan was proposed at a later time*
- *Supervisor Weakley: Advised agreement of the motion (based on clarification provided by Supervisor Campbell)*
- *Supervisor Campbell: Advised disfavor of voting on the proposed project; suggested the County not discourage the Town; would like the County to partner if there was a way to provide more input on overall project costs*
- *Chairman Jackson: Noted that (in his opinion) more information is needed; advised favor of working with the Town*

Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Nays: (0). Absent: Hoffman.

b. Healthy Families Program Proposal – Valerie Ward, DSS Director:

Mary Jane Costello, Finance Director, was present and advised documents were recently received regarding a study to show the effectiveness of the Healthy Families Program.

- *Supervisor McGhee: Questioned if the program would require any financial contributions from the County*
- *Chairman Jackson: Advised that (based on Ms. Ward's comments), contributions would be 'in kind' only (through her department)*

- *Supervisor Campbell: Referred to the structure of the current society and how programs enable folks to be dependent instead of helping themselves; feels that everyone needs to be responsible for their own actions, and that society is heading down a disastrous road; the more society does, the greater the problems become*

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to review the information as presented by Ms. Ward, and to table any action until the next meeting session.

c. Consideration of Contract for Real Estate Assessment – County Administrator Hobbs: County Administrator Hobbs advised that three (3) proposals were received. Review committee consisted of Supervisor Hoffman, Supervisor Campbell, Brian Daniel, Commissioner, Mary Jane Costello, Finance Director and County Administrator Hobbs – summary report has been provided for review and discussion. The committee identified Wingate & Associates, Inc., as having provided the best offer – contract is still under negotiation/review by the County Attorney.

Base Price: \$224,300.00

Add-ons to come (at a later time) if needed

Item wasn't a 'low bid' procurement procedure

He recommended that the Board of Supervisors authorize him to execute a contract with Wingate & Associates, Inc., for the reassessment work at the value stated, subject to negotiation/approval by the County Attorney.

Comments from the Board:

- *Chairman Jackson: Questioned if the proposal extends over a six (6) year period*

County Administrator Hobbs advised that the process would transpire every six (6) years.

- *Supervisor Campbell: Advised that the work being proposed by Wingate & Associates will be 'from scratch' and will not contain any old information from the previous reassessment process; feels the proposed work will allow the County's equalization efforts to be more correct*

Brian Daniel, Commissioner, was present and advised that Wingate & Associates, Inc. has been highly recommended by other localities.

Supervisor Weakley: Verbalized concerns as to whether everything (i.e. addition/improvements to structures) was incorporated into the past reassessment and if the lowest bidder simply incorporated information from the last reassessment process (i.e. based on pricing provided in the low bidder's proposal); advised that Mr. Wingate has advised that he plans to be on site; feels this initiative will reduce the appeals process

County Administrator Hobbs advised that the vendor was asked for pricing to update assessments after the cut-off date; he noted there is always additional work to be done after the project is complete; proposed pricing was also provided to cover any potential litigation (i.e. Wingate & Associates will allow thirty [30] hours for court time), which is a normal aspect of the reassessment process.

The County Attorney advised that in review of the draft, he will meet with the Commissioner on Friday to tie up some loose ends. The proposed payment schedule is based on:

- ✓ 9,350 parcels (in the County)
- ✓ Cost will be \$23.99 per parcel
- ✓ Periodic payments will be made as the vendor completes the assessment
- ✓ There will be a withholding of ten percent (10%) on each payment that the County would make
- ✓ Full payment will be due when the reassessment book is signed and delivered to the Clerk's Office
- ✓ Process will run through January 1, 2019
- ✓ Vendor has agreed that the first payment will be limited to no more than \$60,000.00 until July 1, 2018

- ✓ The County could incorporate more funding into the budget for the next fiscal year

He further advised that the vendor has agreed to take the process through the Board of Equalization process (not an add-on); it's hoped there will be no litigation issues. Although there were problems in the past with the Board of Equalization, there were no litigation issues. In closing, he noted that the proposal appears to be very concrete, and advised that the County would be asked to upgrade per parcel.

Supervisor Campbell moved that the Board approve the contact as recommended, seconded by Supervisor McGhee.

Discussion:

Supervisor Weakley: Questioned if language should be added (pertaining to 'after review' [by the County Attorney])

The County Attorney noted that the contact should be approved as recommended by the Review Committee.

Supervisor Campbell added that approval be '*subject to final review by the County Attorney.*'

Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Nays: (0). Absent: Hoffman.

d. Updates to the Committee Appointment List – Chairman Jackson: Chairman Jackson advised that the and Supervisor Hoffman didn't get an opportunity to meet. He suggested that the County Administrator be excluded as:

- ❖ *Liaison to the Madison Town Council*
- ❖ *Liaison to the Madison County School Board*

Remain on:

- Rappahannock Rapidan Regional Commission
- Shenandoah Committee (to attend meetings at his discretion)

Supervisor Campbell moved that the committee/board appointments for County Administrator Hobbs be approved as amended, seconded by Supervisor McGhee. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Nays: (0). Absent: Hoffman.*

9. New Business:

a. "Go Virginia" Briefing – Helen Cauthen, Central VA Partnership for Economic Development: Helen Cauthen, President of the Central VA Partnership for Economic Development, was present and expressed her gratitude for being the selected support organization for the "Go Virginia" program in the region (i.e. all Central Virginia Partnership Counties [to include Rappahannock and Fauquier]). Ms. Cauthen welcomed County Administrator Hobbs, and thanked Tracey Williams Gardner, Director of Economic Development & Tourism, for being a great allied partner.

Highlights of the "Go Virginia" program were denoted as follows:

- ❖ **Virginia urgently needs strong private-sector growth.** Federal cutbacks have exposed our over-dependence on public-sector jobs. Virginia needs strong private-sector growth and job creation.
- ❖ **Growth in Virginia's diverse regions requires collaboration.** To grow and diversify our economy, business, education, and government must collaborate effectively in each region.
- ❖ **State government must be a catalyst and partner.** State government must provide incentives for strategic, job-focused collaboration in each region of the Commonwealth
- ❖ **What Is Go Virginia:** A statewide initiative (as developed by the General Assembly) through incentivized collaboration between business, education and government to diversify and strengthen the economy in every region. Initiative was created with the intent to create higher paying and better jobs in particular industries needed within the State

❖ Why is GO Virginia Needed

- Virginia urgently needs strong private-sector growth. Federal cutbacks have exposed our over-dependence on public-sector jobs. Virginia needs strong private-sector growth and job creation.
- Growth in Virginia's diverse regions requires collaboration. To grow and diversify our economy, business, education, and government must collaborate effectively in each region.
- State government must be a catalyst and partner. State government must provide incentives for strategic, job-focused collaboration in each region of the Commonwealth

Graphs/Charts were provided that reported the following information:

Commonwealth of Virginia
Average Job Contribution to Gross State Product
By Private Sector in 2015\$\$

Source: HIS Economics, GMU Center for Regional Analysis Sector	Average Job Contribution to GSP
Leisure & Hospitality Services	\$38,000
Retail Trade	\$61,637
Education & Health Services	\$66,868
State and Local Government	\$69,804
Construction	\$83,100
Transport/Warehousing	\$109,136
Military	\$125,215
Professional & Business Service	\$145,211
Wholesale Trade	\$158,875
Federal Government	\$163,125
Manufacturing	\$186,311
Information Services	\$336,162
Financial Services	\$491,636
All Private Sectors Average	\$127,630
All Government Average	\$117,432

The GSP* Effects of Private Sector Job Change
In the Commonwealth of Virginia,
March 2008-August 2016 (in 2015\$\$)

Source: GMU Center for Regional Analysis

* Gross State Product Job	Average	Total
Change	GSP* Value	GSP* Value
-293,300	\$152,807	-\$44,818,293,100
+335,400	\$114,793	38,501,572,200
+ 42,100		-\$6,316,720,900

Although about 42,000 new jobs have been created, the types of jobs created were in the lower GSP category and lower paying categories, which shows the GSP value as decreasing by -\$6,316,720,900, which is why the General Assembly cares about the initiative.

Region 9 Council:

Chair: Brian Cole Executive Site Lead LexisNexis

Vice Chair: Tom Click President & CEO Patriot Aluminum

12 Private Sector Members 11 Public Sector Member

11 Localities = Planning Districts

9 and 10

Timeline:

- October 12 & December 5, 2016: Initial and organizing meetings of State board.
- March 14, 2017: State board certifies all 9 Regional Councils
- Spring: State board approved Regional Councils' work plans and budgets; Statewide orientation summit
- June 13: State board funded regional plans
- Summer: All regions developed Economic Growth & Diversification Plans
- September 12: All plans approved by State board
- December 12: First regional projects (per capita and statewide pools) may be approved by State board
- Two (2) pots of money available



Two Pots of Money Available:

Region	2016 Population	% of Population	Per Capita Formula Allocation FY18
1	388,272	4.6%	\$503,122
2	777,912	9.2%	\$1,008,016
3	376,140	4.5%	\$487,401
4	1,234,587	14.7%	\$1,599,775
5	1,729,109	20.6%	\$2,240,575
6	494,045	5.9%	\$640,182
7	2,461,620	29.3%	\$3,189,761
8	528,528	6.3%	\$684,865
9	421,595	5.0%	\$546,302
Total	8,411,808	100.0%	\$10,900,000

Source: Weldon Cooper July 1, 2016 Population Estimates.

(Per Capita)

STATE-WIDE COMPETITIVE FUNDS

\$11,300,000

Competitive

Today's Focus

*The competitive funding is for inter-regional projects/very large projects in the region, which results if the nine (9) regions plan together to have one than one region participate in a bigger project.

How Does "Go Virginia" Work:

1. Qualifying projects:

Involve two or more localities

Lead to creation of higher paying jobs

Project addresses opportunities, needs, challenges and priorities of each region's Growth & Diversification Plans

2. Projects are submitted to one of nine Regional Councils

3. Each Regional Council submits its per capita projects to the "Go Virginia" Board for final approval

4. Inter-regional projects eligible for competitive grant funding must be approved by each participating Regional Council and then submitted to the "Go Virginia" Board for consideration

Region 9's Growth Plan – Recommended "Opportunities"

- Talent Development
- Growing Existing Businesses
- Innovation/Start-Ups/Commercialization
- Sites
- Other

TARGETED INDUSTRIES

Financial & Business
Services

Food & Beverage
Manufacturing

Information
Technology

Light Manufacturing

Biomedical &
Biotechnology

Potential Project Examples:

Entrepreneurship/Start-Ups/Innovation
 Scale-ups of existing small and medium-sized businesses
 Commercialization of R&D (public and private)
 Startup collaborations (incubator/accelerators)
 Venture capital funding and capital formation
 Export assistance programs

Talent Development:

Business focused training and curriculum development
 Non-degree workforce credentials
 Career and technical education relating to targeted industries

Site Readiness:

Site development
 Regional research and business parks
 Broadband and other communications, data security, and "smart" infrastructure

Ms. Cauthen advised that the Piedmont Workforce Network will be participating in a joint council/board meeting on Monday; a work session will also be held to discuss any projects that the "Go Virginia" council may be interested in. Anyone from the public is more than welcome to provide project ideas.

Grants may NOT be used for:

- Construction of transportation projects (except as ancillary to site development)
- Incentive grants to private companies
- Economic development marketing
- Trade missions
- Quality of life projects

Region 9 Grant Project Pre-application forms can be found on www.GoVirginia9.org. In order for any project to be successful in any locality, there must 50% or more of the region's localities participating, or have enough counties working together to total 211,000 people or the locality has to match \$50,000.00 for up to \$200,000.00 on a project or twenty percent (20%), whichever is larger [i.e. any localities working together must match \$50,000.00 or [once the aforementioned funding match is met] the locality must match twenty percent (20%)] unless there are at least 211,000 individuals are represented by the locality(ies) participating in the proposed project. In closing, she advised that once people starting coming to Madison County with projects, she urged the County to assess is the proposal is an interest that other regional localities may be interesting in sharing the costs for. In closing, she expressed the desire is to make all localities to be aware that "Go Virginia" has a substantial locality match (i.e. in kind, cash equivalent, allocation of space, etc.) that doesn't necessarily have to consist of 'cash'.

Ms. Cauthen noted that the reason the pre-application process is required in order for the council to be certain that any proposed project(s) will qualify for consideration by the "Go Virginia" Board.

Comments from the Board:

Supervisor Campbell: Noted that the County has already spent \$21,000,000.00 since the inception of the program with the federal government; noted that grant money isn't 'free money' but imposes a debt; doesn't feel there will be many jobs for the cost being proposed for jobs being noted (i.e. finance & construction) for a total cost of about \$800,000; verbalized interest in the private sector partnership; noted that VDOT is one of the best job creators in the State, therefore, questioned the fact that funding can't be used to promote transportation services in the County

Supervisor Weakley: Verbalized concerns regarding to targeted industries here (in Madison County); questioned how the County can compete and whether there will be a 'voice' in place for the locality); referred to site readiness and questioned if this includes available sewer services (i.e. some businesses may only need a drain field); feels this lack will be a disadvantage for Madison County; also noted the importance of having broadband service available here and if this is an area where "Go Virginia" can provide some assistance; asked how the county can 'sell' local business and noted that the County has much attractive available space

Supervisor McGhee: Noted local concerns regarding available healthcare for our aging population

Responses from Ms. Cauthen:

- The General Assembly created the "Go Virginia" program
- Funding was allocated per capita
- Anticipates there will be region-wide interest in workforce entrepreneurship or small business incentives that will benefit all, if not most localities and make a difference for the residents
- No pre-applications have been brought forth thus far
- Suggested the citizens be overly creative
- Broadband service is a statewide concern (may be something that can be assessed on a comprehensive basis)
- Partnering efforts could be initiated to include Madison, Culpeper, Greene & Rappahannock (where funding can be invested)
- Madison County does a great job of 'growing' its existing businesses (an area of strength for the locality)
- "Go Virginia" will be happy to provide assistance where possible
- Advised of interest by Amazon.com to establish an office (in another locality)

In closing, she advised that:

- The next discussion will be held at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, October 30th
- Discussions will focus on workforce ideas
- A region-wide workforce initiative isn't yet in place
- Workforce welcomes any suggestions
- Verbalized concerns regarding educational awareness (k-12)
- There are some in the region that don't fully understand how successful some of Madison's local businesses are (i.e. Madison Wood Preservers) and what (services/products) they offer to the public

Additionally, consideration is being made to:

- Develop an initiative that will provide folks with information on various regions
- Provide citizens with a better understanding of what's going on in their locality
- Provide citizens of what types of jobs local businesses are looking to fill

In closing, Ms. Cauthen suggested that concerns pertaining to VDOT and the restrictions regarding transportation funding be brought to the attention of state legislators. She also thanked the Board for the opportunity to provide today's presentation.

b. Discussion on Adjusting December 26 Meeting Date – County Administrator Hobbs: County Administrator Hobbs advised that December 26th falls on a State/County holiday; referred to the Boards bylaws that call for meetings to be moved to the next County business day (if a meeting falls on a holiday); also noted that December 27th, also falls between two (2) holiday weekends. Due to the fact that most localities don't have much going on during the aforementioned time frame, most localities do elect to meet should the need arise. Therefore, he suggested the Chairman use discretion and perhaps cancel the meeting of December 26th if no urgent business arises.

Comments pertained to whether:

- ✓ The meeting could be scheduled for December 19th
- ✓ Whether cancelling the meeting will affect claims

Supervisor Campbell asked to 'adjourn' the last meeting of the 2017 year.

The Finance Director advised that she may be out of town for the Christmas holiday.

The County Attorney also advised that the Organizational Meeting is scheduled on the 1st business day of the new year (January 2, 2018).

After discussion, Supervisor Weakley moved that the Board cancel the 2nd meeting for the month of December, 2017, seconded by Supervisor McGhee. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Nays: (0). Absent: Hoffman.*

c. Status Report on Personnel Policy Repackaging – County Administrator Hobbs: County Administrator Hobbs advised that work has been done to bring the County's personnel policy up to date. Updated amendments have been reviewed. County staff is reviewing the draft. The intention is to have a draft document in order by the end of the month to present to the Board for review.

Comments were made as to whether the policy has been updated during the past several years, and also on the County's procurement policy. County Administrator Hobbs advised that updates have been initiated, but not incorporated into the policy.

Clarissa Berry, Commonwealth Attorney, requested a copy of the draft policy.

It was noted that all departments follow the County's personal policy, excluding the Sheriff's Department.

10. Public Comment

Chairman Jackson opened the floor for public comment. With no public comment being brought forth, Chairman Jackson closed the public comment opportunity

11. Information/Correspondence:

2017 Christmas Luncheon:

Supervisor Weakley: Asked about the 2017 holiday luncheon.

It was advised that the event will be held on Friday, December 15th from 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. at the fire house.

Madison County Schools:

Karen Allen, School Board member, advised that all is going well in the school system; the survey for the search for a new superintendent is not live on the school's home page; citizens are encouraged to provide feedback.

12. Closed Session [2.2-3711(A)(1) Pertaining to Resignation of the E911 Coordinator & 2.2-3711(A)(7) Consultation with Legal Counsel....]

a. Closed Session: On motion of Supervisor Weakley, seconded by Supervisor McGhee, the Board convened in a closed session, pursuant to Virginia Code Section [2.2-3711(A)(1), discussion pertaining to the resignation of the E911 Coordinator, and pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(7), consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members pertaining to the Lain et als. V. Pettit, Jr. Trustees, et als (Leathers Lane) litigation, with the following vote recorded: *Aye: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Nay: (0). Absent: Hoffman.*

b. Motion to Reconvene in Open Session:

On motion of Supervisor Weakley, seconded by Supervisor McGhee, the Board reconvened in open session, with the following vote recorded: *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Nay: (0). Absent: Hoffman.*

c. Motion to Certify Compliance:

On motion of Supervisor Weakley, seconded by Supervisor McGhee, the Board certified by roll-call vote that only matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements pursuant to Virginia Code 2.2-3711(A)(1) & (7), only matters that were identified in the motion to convene

in a closed session were heard, discussed or considered in the closed meeting, with the following vote recorded: *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Nay: (0). Absent: Hoffman.*

As a result of closed session, Supervisor Weakley moved that the County: *Accept the retirement of the E911 Coordinator that will be effective as of December 31, 2017; Authorize the County Administrator to negotiate the use of his accumulated leave prior to that date and the hours he can physically work; Form a transition team consisting of Brian Gordon, Loretta Strothers, Troy Estes, Robert Finks and Jack Hobbs*

Seconded by Supervisor McGhee. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: Campbell. Absent: Hoffman.*

13. Adjournment: With there being no further business, on motion of Supervisor Weakley, seconded by Supervisor McGhee, Chairman Jackson adjourned the meeting. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Nays: (0). Absent: Hoffman.*

R. Clay Jackson, Chairman
Madison County Board of Supervisors

Clerk of the Board of the Madison County Board of Supervisors

Adopted on: November 14, 2017

Copies: Board of Supervisors, County Attorney & Constitutional Officers



Agenda
Regular Meeting (#2)
Madison County Board of Supervisors
Tuesday, October 24, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.
County Administration Building, Auditorium
414 N Main Street, Madison, Virginia 22727



Call to Order

Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence

1. Determine Presence of a Quorum / Adopt agenda

2. Public Comment

3. Constitutional Offices

4. County Departments

5. Committee/Organizations

6. Finance

a. October 2017 Claims

b. Supplemental Appropriations (if any)

7. Minutes

a. #31, #32, #33

8. Old Business:

a. Town of Madison Sidewalk Project Madison Town Councilor, Dan Painter

b. Healthy Families Program Proposal... .. Valerie Ward, DSS Director

c. Consideration of Contract for Real Estate Assessment... .. County Administrator Hobbs

9. New Business:

a. "Go Virginia" Briefing Helen Cauthen, Central VA Partnership for Economic Development

b. Discussion on Adjusting December 26 Meeting Date... .. County Administrator Hobbs

c. Status Report on Personnel Policy Repackaging County Administrator Hobbs

10. Public Comment

11. Information/Correspondence (if any)

12. Closed Session: [2.2-3711(A)(1) Discussion Pertaining to Resignation of the E911 Coordinator & 2.2-3711(A)(7) Consultation with Legal Counsel & Briefings by Staff Members Pertaining to the Lain et als. V. Pettit, Jr. Trustees, et als (Leathers Lane) Litigation]

13. Adjournment

AMENDMENTS DENOTED IN ROYAL BLUE WITH YELLOW HIGHLIGHT